

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

To:

EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
 343 State Street
 Rochester, New York 14650-2201
 ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

COMMUNICATION IN CASES FOR WHICH
 NO OTHER FORM IS APPLICABLE

Date of mailing
 (day/month/year) 01/08/2006

Applicant's or agent's file reference
 89304TJS

REPLY DUE
 See paragraph 1 below

International application No.
 PCT/US2006/008303

International filing date
 (day/month/year) 07/03/2006

Applicant

EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY

1. ☐ REPLY DUE within ~~XXXX~~ days from the above date of mailing

☒ NO REPLY DUE

2. COMMUNICATION:

This International Searching Authority has been informed that the applicant/
 representative has not received the final two pages of the WOISA sent on
 18/07/2006.

Please find enclosed a copy of these documents.

We wish to apologise for any inconvenience caused.

A copy of this letter and its enclosures has been sent to the Internaional
 Bureau in Geneva.

Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority



European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk
 Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
 Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Matthew Davis

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2006/008303

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: EP-A-1 381 207 (SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD) 14 January 2004

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1.1 Independent claim 1 is not clear and no meaningful opinion can be established with regard to the novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of this claim (Art. 33(2) to (4) PCT).

The terms "thin", "thick", "portion" and "main portion" used in claim 1 are vague and indefinite and, as such, leaves the reader in a state of uncertainty regarding the scope of protection provided by the feature in question.

1.2 Dependent claims 2-29 are dependent on claim 1 therefore they are also not clear and no meaningful opinion can be established with regard to the novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of this claim (Art. 33(2) to (4) PCT).

2.1 Independent claim 30 is not clear and no meaningful opinion can be established with regard to the novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of this claim (Art. 33(2) to (4) PCT).

The terms "thin", "thick", "portion" and "main portion" used in claim 30 are vague and indefinite and, as such, leaves the reader in a state of uncertainty regarding the scope of protection provided by the feature in question.

2.1 Dependent claims 31-55 are dependent on claim 30 therefore they are also not clear and no meaningful opinion can be established with regard to the novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability of this claim (Art. 33(2) to (4) PCT).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2006/008303

3. Even if an opinion based on the claims is not possible, a consideration based on the drawings of this application can be done.
The drawings disclose a device that would appear in the light of the documents cited in the Search Report to be new and inventive.

Re Item VII

Certain defects in the international application

1. The features of the claims are not provided with reference signs placed in parentheses (Rule 6.2(b) PCT).
2. Independent claims are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(i) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).
3. The opening part of the description should be modified to bring it into agreement with any amended independent claim (Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY